

What Happened:

On Sunday, November 16, 2025, I stepped into the Dollar General store # 6335 at 1210 West 21st Street, Clovis, NM, 88101-4152, to do some shopping.

However, the cashier at the time, had previously tried to with hold a receipt, entirely.


Moreover, suspiciously, she was on her cellphone, making entries, as I walked past her counter area. As though she were engaged in an advance framing effort, against her theft target. She couldn't seem to excise her phone out of her hand. By contrast, the diligent staff here, are either checking out customers, or stocking the shelves. Their cellphones are not welded to their hands.



Yes: Her standard 'tude is exactly as it appears, in the relevant graphic. No: I didn't simply happen to catch her, "*having a bad hair day*," as it were. You can see her misplaced arrogant sense of entitlement, in the graphic. From her prior conduct along with this incident, it appeared she felt entitlement to commit crime, using her job as a front.

So I inquired if she were the sole cashier on duty, at the time. I simply didn't trust her, to be the one to check me out, if I had decided to buy anything. Yes. She was the only option, that day. She then launched into portions of The Formula, previously shared in a prior Complaint, concerning another fraudster siphoning off of 2 of my neighbors. You may find them familiar.


Taking into account her prior history, the fact that she was on her cellphone, as I went past her register, indicates that she may have been staging an anticipated theft, creating plenty of room for obfuscation. She may have further, been blaming her intended target.



She objected to being recorded.

While not part of The Formula I had previously outlined, doing this, and hostility in general, are PATTERNS among those I suspect of targeting me with their financial fraud efforts. With holding receipts, is another one. The latter can be done by actors on back end technology, including NCR.


This despite that her place of work requires her to work by an interior store camera. Here, you can see it to the left, in the relevant graphic.



She didn't merely imply a threat: She actually did – call - - - well, someone(s). Presumably, law enforcement. Presumably, to automate her intended criminal activity.

To the right, you can see her receding, to shroud my hearing at least her side of her call, as the call connected. Her intent was likely to deprive me of the fair chance to refute whatever she claimed.





Here, she is almost completely receded from her station by the cash register shown in the first graphic. She was definitely trying to prevent my overhearing whatever claims she was making, and determining a reasonable guess, as to whom she had called.

Attending to her cash register?
Stocking shelves? Helping customers?
Nah. Waaaay secondary, in importance.
That would be the relative value assignment of a fraudster, using their job primarily as a front.

~~~~~  
~~~~~  
~~~~~  
~~~~~